IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI

Bail Application No.3894/2006

#	Shailesh Kumar Singh		.....	Petitioner
!		through:	None.	
			VERSUS	
$	State & Anr.		.....	Respondents
^		through:	Mr.Anil Soni, Adv. for State Mr. Amit Srivastava, Adv. for complainant	

Bail Application No.4601-02/2006

#	Ram Dev Singh		.....	Petitioner
!		through:	None.	
			VERSUS	
$	State & Anr.		.....	Respondents
^		through:	Mr.Anil Soni, Adv. for State Mr. Amit Srivastava, Adv. for complainant	

Bail Application No.3798-99/2006

#	Mrs. Manju Devi & Anr.		.....	Petitioners
!		through:	None.	
			VERSUS	
$	State & Anr.		.....	Respondents
^		through:	Mr.Anil Soni, Adv. for State Mr. Amit Srivastava, Adv. for complainant	

% DATE OF DECISION: 07.08.2007

CORAM:

* **Hon'ble Mr.Justice Pradeep Nandrajog**

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?

3. Whether judgment should be reported in Digest?

: **PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J.**(Oral)

FIR No.907/2006 Dt.26.9.2006
U/s498A/304B/34 IPC
P.S: Dabri.

1. Archana Devi was married to Rajesh Kumar Singh on 24.6.2006. She died on 21.9.2006.

2. Above captioned FIR was registered pursuant to statement made by Ravinder Kumar Singh, father of Archana Devi who stated that at the time of marriage of his daughter he gave Rs.3 lacs in cash besides goods worth Rs. 1 lakh. That he spent considerable amount on marriage of his daughter. That he had also agreed to pay Rs.50,000/- to his son-in-law for purchasing a motor cycle. That when his daughter along with her husband went to the native village at Naini, her mother-in-law, brother-in-laws, sister-in-laws and their children taunted his daughter for bringing insufficient dowry. That when mother-in-law of his daughter was admitted for treatment at Army Hospital, the family members taunted his daughter on 22.7.2006, asking for more money to be brought by her from

her father. That on said day her daughter was assaulted by all aforenoted members of the family. That on 17.9.2006 his daughter telephoned him stating that she feared for her life. That he told his daughter to stay calm as he would be coming to Delhi during Durga Puja and would bring her back. That on 21.9.2006 he received a telephone call from the landlord informing that his daughter had been killed by Dharmendra Kumar, younger brother-in-law of the deceased on being instigated by Rajesh Kumar Singh, the elder brother-in-law of the deceased.

3. Vide bail application No.3894/2006 Shailesh Kumar Singh seeks anticipatory bail. I note that Shailesh is the elder brother-in-law of the deceased. Vide bail application No.3798-99/2006, Manju Devi and Seema Kumari the wife and daughter of Shailesh Kumar seek anticipatory bail. Vide bail application No.4601-02/2006, the father-in-law and the mother-in-law of the deceased seek anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State states that a challan has been filed and matter is listed for arguments on charge. Learned counsel for the complainant states that 5 persons have been put up for trial. They are :-

(a) Rajesh Kumar Singh : Husband of deceased

(b) Ram Dev Singh : Father-in-law

(c) Lalmati Devi : Mother-in-law

(d) Shailesh Kumar : Elder brother-in-law

(e) Dharmendra : Younger brother-in-law

5. In that view of the matter, there is no impediment in disposing of bail application No.3798-99/2006 filed by the wife and daughter of Shailesh Kumar Singh holding that since there is no threat, much less any apprehension of they being arrested, no further orders are required. Suffice would it be to state that in the eventuality of any evidence surfacing against said 2 persons at the trial before the learned Trial Judge and on orders passed by the learned Judge directing that said 2 petitioners be arrayed as accused, would a threat of arrest emanate. In said circumstances, Manju Devi and Seema Kumari would have appropriate remedies available to them.

6. As regards Shailesh, Ram Dev, Lalmati, since challan has been presented, the 3 have a right to file an appropriate application before the learned Judge before whom challan has been presented and thereupon would seek appropriate relief.

7. Noting that Shailesh, Ram Dev and Lalmati have been

granted interim protection in the petitions filed by them, their anticipatory bail applications are liable to be disposed of

directing that interim protection granted by this court would enure for their benefit for a period of 4 weeks from today. Within said period of 4 weeks, said 3 persons would be entitled to move appropriate applications seeking regular bail.

8. The 3 captioned petitions stand disposed of as follows :-

(a) Bail Application No. 3798-99/2006 is disposed of as infructuous but with the clarificatory observations in para 5 above.

(b) Bail Application No.3894/2006 and Bail Application No.4601-02/2006 stand disposed of extending interim protection granted to the petitioners for a period of further 4 weeks reckoned with effect from today. Within said period of 4 weeks, petitioners would move an appropriate application before the learned Trial Judge before whom challan has been filed. Needless to state, decision would be taken by the learned Trial Judge, if at all a regular bail application is filed, as per law.

9. Copy of this order be supplied dasti to learned counsel for the petitioners.

August 07, 2007 **PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J.**
vg